

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are pending. Claims 1, 9 and 18 are amended herein.

### 103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Specification of the Bluetooth System, Wireless Connections Made Easy, Profiles" ("the Specification") in view of Slaughter, III et al. ("Slaughter;" U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) and further in view of Kephart et al. ("Kephart;" U.S. Patent No. 6,026,445). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 is not shown or suggested by the Specification, Slaughter and Kephart, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the statement in the instant Office Action that the combination of the Specification and Slaughter does not disclose determining whether a name for a responding device is present in memory cache, transmitting a wireless request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache, receiving a name for the responding device in response to the wireless request, and storing the name received from the responding device in the memory cache, where the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Kephart overcomes the shortcomings of the Specification and Slaughter, as discussed below.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Kephart (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) does not show or suggest "receiving a name for said responding device in response to said wireless request; and storing said name received from said responding device in said memory cache, wherein said name is indexed in said memory cache using said address for said responding device and wherein said name is retrievable from said memory cache using said address" as recited in independent Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that Kephart (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) does not show or suggest "receiving a name for said responding device in response to said wireless request; storing said name and said address received from said responding device in said memory cache, said name indexed by said address; and using said name to retrieve said address from said memory cache" as recited in independent Claim 9 (emphasis added).

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Kephart (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) does not show or suggest "storing said address and said name received from said responding device in said memory cache, said name indexed by said address; and retrieving said name from said memory cache to subsequently identify said responding device in lieu of performing a second wireless request after said first wireless request, wherein said name is retrieved from said memory cache using said address" as recited in independent Claim 18 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that Kephart (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) only describes using a name as an index for an address, so that a name is used to retrieve an address. The present claimed invention recites exactly the opposite.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification, Slaughter and Kephart, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 9 and 18, and that Claims 1, 9 and 18 are therefore in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification, Slaughter and Kephart, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 dependent on Claims 1, 9 and 18, and that Claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

#### Conclusions


In light of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis

Reg. No. 46,120

Date: 1/18/05

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060